Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TWO SUFFRAGE MISTAKES

BY MOLLY ELLIOT SEAWELL

THE PROPOSED SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

THE National Woman Suffrage Association and the entire body of suffragists stand fully committed to the proposed Constitutional amendment, conferring suffrage on women. A Congressional Committee of suffragists, with headquarters in Washington, and also a Congressional Union, have been organized to work for the proposed amendment. A large sum of money is being raised to prosecute the campaign, and members of Congress who oppose the amendment have received official warning that they will be fought in their home districts, and the Democratic party as a whole will be held accountable if the amendment is not submitted to the legislatures of the several States.

The party in power has apparently shown great shrewdness in meeting the suffrage crisis. One of the first acts of the party leaders at the called session of the Sixty-third Congress, in April, 1913, was to have a Committee on Woman Suffrage appointed in the Senate. This committee was carefully selected with a view to prompt and favorable action on the suffrage amendment. That the course of the committee was prearranged by the Democratic leaders was assured in the statement of Senator Thomas, of Colorado, the chairman. Senator Thomas announced, immediately after the appointment of the committee, that, although a hearing would be given to the women opposed to suffrage, the committee had already determined to report favorably the suffrage resolution. This was done, the resolution being Senate Joint Resolution Number 1 of the Sixty-third Congress. The Democratic leaders played the game and the suffragists seem to have accepted as bread the stone offered them by the Senate. Thus, the party leaders skilfully put the Democratic Senate on record as indorsing woman suffrage, and

threw the issue promptly into the House of Representatives, which was and is the real battlefield. It was understood that as soon as the tariff and the currency bills were disposed of, the suffrage issue should have the right of way. The suffragists, who do not seem to have suspected the political management of the case, as soon as the Committee on Rules assembled, after the Christmas recess, asked that a Committee on Woman Suffrage be appointed in the House of Representatives, as in the Senate. This request was perfectly reasonable, but was promptly denied. The vote ignored party and sectional lines, thus showing that the Republicans saw the astuteness of the Democratic programme, and were willing to profit by it.

After the refusal of the Committee on Rules to appoint a House Committee on Woman Suffrage, the question was brought before the Democratic caucus on February 3d and received a severe defeat, 123 to 57.

These defeats, however, have in no way changed the intention of the suffragists to continue the battle for the suffrage amendment, and they have so announced through their officials. Indeed, no other course is open to them, after having organized for the purpose of getting a suffrage amendment, and, as in the case of other political organizations, the only way they can secure victory is by defeating their opponents at the polls.

So, by good political management, the Democratic leaders have put the Democratic Senate on record as favoring woman suffrage, and by forcing the fighting in the House of Representatives they have succeeded in bringing the suffrage issue before the people in time for the November elections of 1914. Then, the real strength of the suffrage movement will be known eighteen months in advance of the national convention of 1916. Of course the attitude of the two great parties toward woman suffrage in 1916 will be determined by the showing of the 1914 Congressional election.

But there are conclusive reasons for saying that no suffrage amendment of any kind will ever again be incorporated in the Constitution of the United States. Never in the history of politics has there been a more vivid example of misdirected energy or greater unfamiliarity with the structure and history of the American Government than in the efforts of the suffragists for a woman suffrage amend-

ment to the Constitution. It requires only a rudimentary knowledge of the government and political history of the United States to see the practical impossibility of three-fourths of the States adopting a suffrage amendment.

The right of a State to create and control its own electorate is the corner-stone of its autonomy, and where there is a race problem involved it is the rock upon which its civilization rests. The proposition made by the suffragists is, that the States shall voluntarily give up to the Federal Government this great fundamental right of creating and controlling their own electorates, a right upon which their liberties are based, and this for the sake of woman suffrage, which any State may acquire at any time without giving up any right of any sort. Under the proposed amendment there would be in every State two electorates—a masculine electorate, created and controlled by the State, and a feminine electorate, created and controlled by the Federal Government. The electorate of women would be entirely above and beyond the laws and forces of the State, which could neither regulate, control, amend, nor abolish it. If as many as thirty-seven States adopted the amendment, it would be fastened upon the twelve remaining States against their protest. And if these twelve States should be the populous States, the amendment might be forced and fastened upon the country by a minority of the votes of the country. The women who would constitute this Federal electorate would not be allowed a voice in the revolution that would charge them with vast responsibilities, take away their property privileges, as in the suffrage States, and alter their status in every particular, because the suffragists do not contemplate any referendum to women. As a matter of history the suffragists have consistently and successfully opposed a referendum to women, of whom only 8 per cent. in the United States are on record as favoring suffrage. The feminine electorate proposed to be created by the woman suffrage amendment would necessarily constitute a privileged class, helpless and irresponsible, enacting laws which they could not enforce, legislating upon naval and military affairs, shipping, navigation, and other subjects in which no woman has any practical experience, and exempt from naval, military, police, fireman's and all life-saving duty, and all dangerous employments, unable to assist in the enforcement of law or the maintenance of order. This division would be

strictly one of sex, as every man at some period of his life can perform these duties, while no woman at any period of her life can perform them. The situation would be further complicated by terrible race problems. There are, in the Southern States, approximately 2,000,000 negro women; in Oregon, 366 Chinese and Japanese women; in Washington, 1,298; and in California, 5,936. It is the invariable tendency of all alien races to act as a unit, and this was very clearly emphasized when the Federal Government once before attempted to create an electorate independent of the State, which might and did defy the State. The negroes, when they voted, gave their solid vote to the Republican party. These 2,000,000 negro women might, if they chose, dominate the Southern States, and the 7,600 Chinese and Japanese women in California, Oregon, and Washington, where Asiatic men are not allowed to vote, might swing those States in matters, not only of trade, but of war or peace with China and Japan. To complete the shrieking and screaming absurdity of the proposition, if the amendment should, or rather could, be adopted, it would appear on the face of the Constitution as if women alone voted in the United States, as there is no mention in the immortal document of men voting.

On the part of the Federal Government, the creation of the proposed electorate would be easy enough, like letting the genie out of the trunk. But any attempt to defend, control, or even regulate it, except in the weak States, would be practically impossible. It is one of the features of supreme wisdom in the Constitution, that although the Federal Government has ample power to protect the States, and to settle differences among them, it has no machinery to rob them of their liberties except the army and navy, for the small force of United States marshals and their deputies is totally inadequate to control or even protect an electorate unless it be phenomenally small. This shows another integral feature in the American Government—that an electorate which cannot protect itself has no place in the American system. The Federal electorate of women which the amendment would create is, approximately, 13,000,000. It is true that the Rev. Anna Howard Shaw, President of the National Woman Suffrage Association of the United States, stated before the Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage, on April 21, 1913 (Senate Joint Resolution 1, of the Sixty-third Congress, page 93):

I have heard the statement made over and over again, that men are afraid of adding the large illiterate vote of the women to the illiterate vote of the men of to-day. While we will add some illiterates, about 3,000,000, you know we will add 24,000,000 of voters, and you can afford out of 24,000,000 votes to take 3,000,000 of illiteracy, and have 21,000,000 of intelligence left. (Applause.) But we will not only cancel our 3,000,000 of illiteracy by 3,000,000 of intelligence, which will leave us 18,000,000 of intelligence, but being generous to men, we will give 4,000,000 of intelligent women to cancel 4,000,000 ignorant men, and then we will have left 14,000,000 of intelligence to add to your 21,000,000 of intelligence, and see what an improvement that will make in the whole nation. (Applause.)

If Miss Shaw's figures be correct, the women, when enfranchised will be able to outvote the men nearly two to one. The official figures of the Presidential election of November, 1912, when the largest vote ever cast in the United States was polled, amounted to 14,720,057, and according to the latest official figures there is an excess of 2,692,288 men in the country. The electorate of women which the Rev. Anna Howard Shaw proposes to create with the assistance of not less than thirty-seven States would therefore be about 13,000,000, instead of 24,000,000 as the Rev. Anna Howard Shaw innocently supposes, that is, provided the figures of the United States Census may be taken seriously and not considered as practical jokes. "Oh, *sancta simplicitas!*" as Mephistopheles says.

Another embarrassment provided for the Federal Government by the proposed suffrage amendment is that the Federal Government would be obliged to define all the qualifications of all the women voters in all the States, and these qualifications would, of course, have to be identical. This would inevitably produce conflicts with State laws, as the qualifications of voters are by no means the same in all the States. It would also lead to disputes between the States concerning the fourth article, second section of the Constitution, prohibiting a State from granting to the citizens of one State privileges not common to the citizens of the several States. It would, of course, be necessary for every State which adopted the amendment—if any of the States adopt it—to revise its constitution. Revisions of constitutions are tedious and expensive performances.

Not only does the proposed suffrage amendment provide generously for the Federal Government in the way of complication at home, but it carefully and thoughtfully lays up

a store of dangerous embroilments with foreign Powers. It would make voters out of Chinese and Japanese women, while the laws of certain States preclude Chinese and Japanese men from voting. It is true that Chinese women, under the leadership of the suffragists, voted in San Francisco at the Presidential election of 1912, but their votes were probably illegal. The denial of equal rights to the Chinese and Japanese men would cause demands to be made upon the United States by powerful nations with arms in their hands, and the ladies who would have brought about these cataclysms would be of no service whatever in the defense of the country.

Attractive, therefore, as this suffrage programme sounds, it cannot be accomplished. The creation of a Federal electorate independent of the States is in the nature of an exploded experiment, and the history of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments and the frightful record of reconstruction in the Southern States show conclusively how a Federal electorate, beyond and above the power of the State, would work. Those two amendments were hasty and retaliatory legislation, which was never approved by three-fourths of the States, and which have no defenders to-day, except the suffragists. The Southern States never made any pretense of submitting to the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, but, obeying the natural and higher law of self-preservation, gave notice that the electorate created by the Federal Government would vote at its peril. Here came in one of the many and admirable checks and balances of the great charter of American liberty, the Constitution of the United States. Although Congress might enact foolish and wicked legislation, like the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, which through a Federal electorate would have handed over to anarchy eleven States in the Union, it had not the power to carry out the mandate to throttle those States. The army and the navy are the only available forces of the United States, and the American people never have tolerated and never will tolerate the presence of soldiers and sailors at the polls. The few feeble and sporadic attempts to use the army for the defense of the Federal electorate were disastrous to the party in power, and the excellent precedent was established that an electorate under the American system must be able to defend itself, and to carry out its own will, independent of military

forces, and thereby accept the responsibility of its own votes. When the true nature and the tyrannical and destructive principle of a Federal electorate were realized, the whole country acquiesced in sending the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the scrap-heap of legislation. Meanwhile the States passed election laws to suit themselves and flatly conflicting with these two amendments. The courts sustained these laws and the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments died legally as they had died actually.

But although the question of the Federal Government creating an electorate in a State was settled for all time, yet even the weak and temporary effort to sustain this electorate resulted in terrible disorders and lasting complications. The Federal electorates and Federal Government imposed upon the Southern States incurred vast debts without the authority of the States, looted the State treasuries, and laid up a store of political and financial embarrassments which are continually coming up to plague those States even at the present day. However, the Federal electorate passed out of existence, and there is no probability that it will ever be revived, particularly for woman suffrage. Any State may adopt suffrage in a perfectly sane and safe manner, without handing itself over, tied hand and foot, to the Federal Government, which does not want and cannot manage such a charge.

It is perfectly safe to say that the eleven seceding States would immediately retire to private life any Senator or Representative in Congress who would vote to create a Federal electorate, especially as it would be accompanied by the enfranchisement of two million negro women. Some of the Southern suffragists attempted to meet this difficulty by imitating a section of the British suffragists, who published a list of governmental questions in which they did not propose to interfere, such as the army, the navy, etc. Miss Jane Addams, Vice-President of the National Woman Suffrage Association, has, several times, in print and in speeches, suggested that women shall vote only upon questions directly affecting their own interests. The Southern suffragists declared they did not mean to enfranchise the negro women. But how can they prevent it if the suffrage amendment should be adopted and become a part of the organic law? And what is to

be thought of an electorate such as certain of the British suffragists desire, which admits its unfitness to legislate upon some of the greatest questions of government? What would be thought if either of the great political parties in the United States should proclaim, "We do not propose to interfere with the army and the navy, or the tariff or the currency?" Can anything more grotesque than such an electorate be imagined?

However, with or without the negro question, the eleven seceding States will never submit to any interference by the Federal Government with their electorates, or permit the creation of a Federal electorate among them. These eleven seceding States can, of themselves, with two other States, defeat the amendment. But there are five contiguous States—Maryland, West Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri—which have large negro populations, and these States would no more allow negro men and women a share in their government than the seceding States would, and would be lined up against the suffrage amendment, making sixteen States certain to reject it. The solidarity of the alien races will always make their vote a menace, and it was this, among other causes, that doomed the Federal electorate created by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. Under the proposed suffrage amendment the negro and Chinese and Japanese women would soon be organized so as to hold the balance of power in their States, as the Mormon women really hold the balance of power in Utah, Colorado, and Idaho. The three Pacific coast States—California, Oregon, and Washington—have a race problem on their hands more acute even than Southern States have in the negro problem. The admission of Chinese and Japanese women to the polls would not only fearfully complicate the race problem, but would create terrible embroilments for the Federal Government. Those States have already passed laws which the Japanese claim to be infractions of treaties, and of the sixth article of the Constitution, forbidding the States to pass laws contravening treaty rights. The present Administration made protests to California which were undoubtedly known in advance to be unavailing, but the Administration was able to shield itself behind the autonomy of the States. It will be recalled that at the time of the passage of the Geary Exclusion Act the people of California were a unit in declaring that,

whether the act were passed or not, the Chinese should not enter California. The threat of war made no impression on the Pacific coast States then, any more than it does now, for history shows that men will not only disregard the statute law when it conflicts with the natural law, but that they will always prefer war to giving up what they think is necessary for their existence. Where there is a controversy between the American Government and a foreign power over a race problem, the State governments are a buffer between the nations. If this suffrage amendment could pass, this buffer would be taken away, and the United States would have to deal directly with China and Japan in this question of admitting the women of those races to citizenship and excluding the men, and no one can foresee the end. These three Pacific coast States already have suffrage, which was forced upon them by the Socialists, without consulting the women of these States through a referendum, and in the case of Washington and California, actually by a minority of the voters. These three States, when called upon to choose between giving a complimentary vote to suffrage, which they already have, and admitting Chinese and Japanese women to the polls, where they might be relied upon to vote for the admission of their countrymen, would certainly go into the same column as the seceding and border States. This would make nineteen States that would undoubtedly throw out the suffrage amendment with its independent Federal electorate.

The representatives in Congress of these three Pacific coast States would be placed in a singular predicament. If they voted against the suffrage amendment the National Woman Suffrage Association has promised to defeat them in their States; while if they voted for the enfranchisement of Chinese and Japanese women, their constituents would make of them a Roman holiday. It may, however, be stated with safety that there is no more chance of these States surrendering their autonomy to the Federal Government for something they already have than the Southern States would walk back into the Gehenna from which they have once escaped, in order to acquire suffrage when they can have it at any moment they wish to create a little Gehenna of their own.

Then there are the weaker States, such as Delaware, Rhode Island, Nevada, and Oklahoma. There, indeed, the

Federal Government, so unequal to coercing a strong State, would have a fearful power. If these States ever consented to sell their birthright for a mess of suffrage pottage, which they may have at any time they choose, they would be absolutely at the mercy of the party in power in all Federal elections. A couple of regiments in any one of those States could steal its electoral vote, send any man or woman to Congress desired by the Federal administration, and treat the State as a conquered province. It is not to be supposed that the legislatures of these States would be so ignorant as not to know that this proposed suffrage amendment would be surrendering the autonomy of the State, at one stroke, to the Federal Government. Therefore, these States may be placed in line with those which would laugh the suffrage amendment out of court.

Again, powerful States like New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, with large foreign populations, would be most unlikely to invite the convulsions and disasters of a Federal electorate with a high percentage of foreign women quite independent of State control. It must not be forgotten that the legislatures of these great States will not be so trustful and altruistic as the ladies who advocate this suffrage amendment, but will go to work in a perfectly cold-blooded way, without considering the advantages of the pure milk, etc., promised by the suffragists, and will not commit political *hara-kiri* even to oblige the Congressional Committee and the Congressional Union of the National Woman Suffrage Association.

Although there does not seem to be any reason why any State should adopt so destructive a principle as the proposed amendment embodies, and which is entirely unnecessary if suffrage be the object in view, yet it is quite possible that the three suffrage States dominated by the Mormon Church might, through the Mormon power, and for Mormon reasons, vote for the amendment (if they have a chance). The latest figures give the acknowledged Mormon population of Utah as 56 per cent., although it is probably much greater, while in Colorado, with a Mormon population of 19 per cent. and Idaho with 25 per cent., the Mormon voters hold the balance of power, and exercise that power. The Mormon Church has ever been the best friend of suffrage and the steady enemy of the Federal Government. Polygamy, which is prohibited by no less than three

Federal statutes, is not only a practice among the Mormons, but is a tenet of the Mormon religion. In this it goes much further than Mohammedanism. The Prophet permitted his followers to have four wives, but the Mormon creed inculcates polygamy as a religious duty, and every Mormon man and woman is compelled by his or her conscience to believe in polygamy and practise it as far as he or she can. It is true that Congress forced Utah to incorporate an anti-polygamy clause in its constitution, before admitting the State into the Union. This clause was cheerfully indorsed by the Mormons, but with how much good faith may be imagined by the long list of open and confessed polygamists sent to Congress by Utah. As a matter of fact, no man has ever been sent to either House of Congress who was unfriendly to the Mormon Church. And why should Utah, with 56 per cent. openly Mormon, ever send a Gentile to Congress?

The religious aspect of polygamy makes Mormonism a danger to the State, and differentiates those who have been born or reared in polygamy from those who have been born and reared to regard it as a civil and religious crime. Suffrage has not only conspicuously failed to check polygamy, but it is the general consensus of opinion that Mormonism has gained, rather than lost strength, since the adoption of woman suffrage by Utah in 1896. One thing is certain, if woman suffrage had not sustained Mormonism, suffrage would have been abolished long ago in Utah, with 56 per cent. openly Mormon. A good indication that Mormonism is not weak under woman suffrage is shown by divorce statistics. Although in the divorce belt and surrounded by suffrage States, which head the list in divorce, statistics show that Utah is the nineteenth State in its proportion of divorces, because Mormons do not divorce. Concerning the prospects of the proposed amendment in these three suffrage States, where the Mormons hold the balance of power, nothing can be predicted, except that whatever could be done would be for the benefit of the Mormon Church.

THE OPPOSITION TO THE PAYMENT OF THE INCOME TAX

The second mistake made by the suffragists in the campaign of 1914 concerns the income tax. In an official statement issued by the Congressional Union of the National Woman Suffrage Association from its headquarters in

Washington, dated December 30, 1913, while not advising militant resistance to payment of the income tax, it indorses resistance, and gives the following reason: "It is an accepted principle of all free governments that taxation without representation is tyranny."

It is, however, known to all students of the American Government that "taxation without representation is tyranny" is not, and never was, a principle of government, any more than the glittering generality that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." This statement about taxation and representation was a mere oratorical phrase of James Otis, and was used as a catch-word at the beginning of the Revolution. A principle, exactly contrary to this catch-word, was adopted at the organization of the Government of the United States and has remained in full force ever since as a basic principle. This is, that votes and taxes have no essential relation. This principle differentiated the American Government at the time from all existing governments, and was in effect a new departure. In monarchical countries, where property votes, there is a direct, though not an essential relation between votes and taxes. But this is gradually disappearing, and never had any existence in the United States. For, from the beginning, large numbers of persons were taxed who were not permitted to vote, and large numbers of persons voted, and even administered the Government, who were not taxed, because they had nothing taxable. A man may be President of the United States who does not pay a penny in taxes except the head tax at the time of registration, and which is intended to pay the expenses of the election, and is levied only on registered voters. And a person who pays taxes on millions of dollars may be denied a vote. In every way this divorce between votes and taxes is obvious in both the State and Federal governments. There is no property qualification required in any Federal election, and the property qualifications in the States are merely nominal, in some States being as low as $2.50. It may be noted that whenever the suffragists try to sustain this position they are compelled to resort to instances in monarchical governments, as nothing in the American Government sustains it, but, on the contrary, evidence flatly contradicts it. In the very statement issued by the Congressional Committee of the National Woman Suffrage Associa-

tion, on the subject of resisting the income tax, the precedents given are, the advice of Mr. Lloyd-George, the Socialist Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain, and the refusal of certain Welsh dissenting churches to contribute to the support of the Anglican Church. But the American Government is not socialistic, and is not administered by Socialists, and there is no State Church in the United States. So these examples readily show the weakness of the position that the payment of taxes entitles one to representation, and the exclusion from voting entitles one to exemption from taxation.

A very slight examination will show the fallacy of the taxation-without-representation-is-tyranny notion. If only those voted who paid taxes, very few women would vote. There are no official figures to show the proportion of women taxpayers to men taxpayers, but tax experts have estimated that there are not more than 350,000 independent women taxpayers in the United States. This, of course, is exclusive of the large amount of property assessed in the names of married women whose husbands pay the taxes. The income-tax figures seem to bear out the estimate of about 350,000 women who actually pay their own taxes. From this estimate must be deducted a large percentage of women who, although actually paying taxes, are for various reasons, such as nonage, etc., ineligible to vote. Therefore, if it be "an accepted principle of all free governments that taxation without representation is tyranny," the Rev. Anna Howard Shaw's 24,000,000 women in buckram would shrink to about 300,000 who are entitled to a vote because they pay taxes. If being deprived of a vote exempted from taxation, then the entire population of the District of Columbia, 353,299 souls, could claim exemption from taxation, because they are denied a vote. The entire army, navy, and marine corps of the United States, amounting in round numbers to 150,000 men, would be exempt, as they are practically disfranchised by difficulty of acquiring residence, etc., and they are even precluded by Section 1763, Revised Statutes of the United States, from having any share in the administration of the Government for which they may be called upon to lay down their lives. All convicts would be exempt from taxation because convicts lose their civil rights. The multitude of aliens who pay taxes, but who are not allowed to vote, would also

be exempt. But this would be merely the beginning of exemptions. All that anybody would have to do in order to escape taxation would be to go to the nearest foreign consular office and forswear his or her allegiance to the Government of the United States and become an alien—for there is no law in any statute-book in the world prohibiting a man from choosing his own citizenship or subjectship. In short, if it is "an accepted principle of all free governments that taxation without representation is tyranny," nobody need pay taxes who does not want to pay taxes, and the public income would cease.

There is, however, a new and startling principle which is rapidly developing concerning votes and taxes. This is, a disposition to make women pay for their immunities. Men not only pay nearly all the money taxes, but they pay a service tax from which women are of necessity exempt. According to press despatches, the Russian Douma is considering the levy in Finland, where women vote, of a special tax, amounting to about three million dollars in American money, upon the ground that, although Finland pays no more money or service taxes to the government than any other province in the empire, it has more votes, and therefore should pay for the privilege. In the New York Assembly a bill was introduced in 1913 providing that women who voted should lose their dower, as in the suffrage States, and should have no alimony in divorces. This is strictly in line with the equal rights demanded by the suffragists, and more will be heard of it in the future.

Along with the unique "principle of government" advocated by the suffragists there is an equally unique and very striking feature of opposition among women to suffrage. The organized suffragists amount to about 8 per cent. of the whole body of women in this country. The remaining 92 per cent. are either indifferent or opposed to suffrage. But never before in the history of suffrage have those whose enfranchisement is proposed been indifferent to suffrage, or dreamed of opposing it. The negroes, although totally illiterate and unfit for suffrage at the time of their enfranchisement, hailed it with joy. There is no instance on record of any body of men refusing the ballot, much less fighting against it. But from the time that suffrage was first proposed to women there has been general indifference to it among women, and active hostility to it

among many women. At the present time there are in seventeen non-suffrage States associations of women organized to oppose suffrage, and in several suffrage States there are organizations of women to secure the repeal of suffrage. It is noteworthy that in none of the suffrage States has there been a referendum to the women of those States. The suffragists have steadily, vigorously, and violently fought referendums. Even when the Massachusetts Legislature passed the bill providing for a referendum to the women of the State in 1895, the suffragists not only attacked the bill, but after it had been passed urged the Governor to veto it. In this, the only referendum held so far, the suffragists polled only 22,204 votes out of an estimated total of 575,000 women of voting age in Massachusetts. The suffragists have tried, in many ways, to account for this result, one reason given being that the measure did not carry full suffrage. But in no case have the suffragists fought even limited suffrage. As a matter of fact, they worked hard in Massachusetts, spent much money, predicted victory in their official organ, *The Woman's Journal,* and got 22,204 votes from the women of Massachusetts. Naturally, ever since then, the suffragists have had the same objection to referendums that Falstaff had to security: "I would as lief he put ratsbane in my mouth." At the suffrage hearing before the New York Assembly in March, 1912, a statement was read by Mrs. E. Palmer Gavit, saying that from "personal investigation" she was prepared to say that the women of New York were "overwhelmingly in favor of suffrage." Mrs. Gavit was immediately followed by Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, who argued fiercely against a referendum. There is a tragic absence of humor in the suffrage body.

The reason given by the suffragists against a referendum is that women would be coerced or persuaded by men into defeating suffrage. That is to say, women are fully qualified to vote on all subjects except as to whether they shall or shall not vote, and this, according to the suffragists, is the question most vital to women. This reasoning is enough to make a graven image smile. If the proposition were submitted to the late Professor Aristotle as he paced the groves of Parnassus, his laughter would echo down the corridors of time. But even if it were true that women wanted the ballot and were afraid to take it when it is offered them,

how easily this difficulty could be overcome by the use of the Australian ballot in referendums!

It may be asked, if women are too timid and too ignorant to secure the alleged enormous benefits of suffrage when offered to them without money and without price, would such an ignorant and timid electorate be of any benefit to any country? Would it not rather be a detriment? May it not be that women, as a sex, see the disadvantages and burdens of the ballot for themselves and the country, and refuse it on intelligent grounds? All of the women who oppose suffrage are not wholly stupid or uninformed. The fact is that suffrage, like most things, has its price to women as to men. Miss Jane Addams said in *The Ladies' Home Journal* in 1910 that "suffrage is a simple thing—merely putting a piece of paper in a ballot-box." In a statement made by Miss Addams before the House Judiciary Committee of the Sixty-second Congress, on March 13, 1912 (Serial No. 2, page 8), she said, "The franchise is only a little bit of mechanism which enables the voter to say how much money shall be appropriated from the taxes, of which women pay so large a part." Imagination stands aghast at this conception of the franchise on the part of the Vice-President of the National Woman Suffrage Association. Students of suffrage agree that it is one of the most complex, far-reaching, and abstruse things on this planet, dealing with stupendous matters other than taxes, differing in every country, with strange powers of self-adjustment, governed by laws as mysterious as they are inflexible, following the natural rather than the statute law, touching every relation of life, and demanding its price always from both men and women. A wonderful example of the tremendous and complicated nature of what Miss Addams calls "a little bit of mechanism which enables a voter to say how much money shall be appropriated for taxes," may be found in Miss Addams's own State of Illinois. At the suffrage hearing before the House Judiciary Committee of the Sixty-second Congress, on March 13, 1912 (Serial No. 2, page 79), the following colloquy took place between Miss Jane Addams and Mr. Littleton and Mr. Davis of the Committee:

MR. LITTLETON. Cannot the Legislature of Illinois grant women suffrage?

MISS ADDAMS. No; they have not that power. . . .

MR. DAVIS. They have no power to organize and submit a Constitutional amendment?

MISS ADDAMS. They have to do it through a Constitutional convention. They cannot do it by legislative enactment.

Nevertheless, the Illinois Legislature at the earnest solicitation of the suffragists passed a woman suffrage bill in 1913. The legislators took care to pass this bill in a form which the Attorney-General of Illinois warned them was unconstitutional, and they had full knowledge that only a few months before, in a preferential election in Chicago, woman suffrage had been defeated by more than two to one. The Governor signed the bill, and under it women in Illinois have registered to vote. Another illegality has occurred, in the almost universal falsification of the age given by the women who have registered to vote. Any and every one of these voters may be challenged at the polls. Meanwhile, the validity of the law is being attacked in the courts, and to add to the general confusion a call for a Constitutional convention is before the Illinois Legislature, and such a convention may repeal the suffrage bill and so complicate matters indefinitely. Thus, by the inexperience and inexpertness of the suffrage leaders, the "little bit of mechanism" may jeopardize the whole vote of Illinois, which polled at the Presidential election of 1912 1,146,193 votes. In the event of a close contest in the Congressional election of 1914, there are vast possibilities of trouble in Illinois, due to what the Vice-President of the National Woman Suffrage Association calls "a little bit of mechanism." These are some of the difficulties the States have to deal with in adopting suffrage of their own initiative, but these are airy trifles compared with the method advocated by the suffragists in the proposed impracticable Federal amendment. There is, however, no more chance that the States will pay with their fundamental liberties for suffrage than the Sultan of Zanzibar will trade his throne for a steam-heating plant. And as for the income tax, a ruthless Government will continue to exact it, just as if Mr. James Otis had never lived and sung and died.

MOLLY ELLIOT SEAWELL.